

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending.

Claims 1, 2, 5-10, 13-16 and 19-22 were rejected.

Claims 3-4, 11-12 and 17-18 were indicated as allowable but they were objected to.

Claims Allowable but Objected to:

The examiner indicated that claims 3-4, 11-12 and 17-18 were allowable; however, these claims were "objected to" since they are dependent upon rejected claims.

Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be held in abeyance until, final disposition of the parent claims.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 2, 5-10, 13-16 and 19-22 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Admitted Prior Art in Fig. 2 in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,876,657 to Brewer (hereinafter Brewer).

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-10, 13-16 and 19-22 based upon Brewer and the Admitted Prior art for either one or both of the following two reasons:

First, the filing date of the cited Brewer reference is December 14, 2000. The filing date of the subject application is December 12, 2000. It is noted that the Brewer reference does not contain or assert any priority claim to a filing date earlier than December 14, 2000. Thus, applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection based upon the Brewer reference since the Brewer reference has a later filing date than does the subject application.

Second, the cited references do not teach the invention claimed by the applicant for the following reasons.

The rejected claims are directed to a technique for facilitating routing table lookup. Routing table lookup operations examine information in a packet header to determine a packet's routing. As a packet moves through a network, multiple processors may perform routing table lookup operations.

The method (or system) specified by claims 1, 2, 5-10, 13-16 and 19-22 includes two processors that perform routing table lookup operations. The first routing table lookup operation is a conventional routing table lookup operation performed by a first processor. **The second routing table lookup operation is performed using a special and unique technique that is not taught or suggested in the prior art.**

The method (or system) specified by claims 1, 2, 5-10, 13-16 and 19-22 facilitates the second routing table lookup operation, by having the first processor attach an identifier tag to the packet. The second processor utilizes this identifier tag to facilitate the routing table lookup operation.

The language of claim 1 will now be used as an example; however, it is noted that the other rejected claims have similar language. The method defined in claim 1 includes the following steps:

- a) "using a first processor ... to perform a routing table lookup for a received packet;"
- b) "determining, from ... the routing table lookup, a routing table identifier...;"
- c) "passing the identifier and the received packet to the second processor; ..."
- c) "the second processor retrieving routing information for the received packet from a routing table, using the identifier...".

The system shown in Brewer referenced does show multiple processors that process packets. Furthermore, in the system shown in the Brewer reference, the first processor that examines a packet header does attaches a sequence number to the packet header. This sequence number is used by later engines that process the packets to arrange the packets in a correct order.

In the applicant's system the information added to packets by the first processor is entirely different information from that added by the first processor in Brewer's system. Specifically, applicant's claims specifies that the first routing table lookup determines "a routing table identifier" and a second processor uses this "identifier" to facilitate a routing table lookup operation.

Stated differently, the Brewer reference does not teach the step that is recited in claim 1 as:

"the second processor retrieving routing information for the received packet from a routing table, using the identifier *(that was added by the first processor)* to determine the location of the routing information in the routing table"
(emphasis and parenthetical comment added).

Applicant's claims specifically call for using an identifier, determined from a first routing table lookup operation, to facilitate a second routing table lookup operation. There is no suggestion of any such method in the Brewer reference.

CONCLUSION:

For the above reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-10, 13-16 and 19-22 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Prompt allowance of claims 1-22 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Elmer Galbi', written over a horizontal line.

Elmer W. Galbi
Reg. No. 19,761

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613
E-Mail: Elmer@techlaw.com